

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3 through 11 are now pending in the application. Claims 1 and 5 through 11 are herein amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW CONDUCTED FEBRUARY 6, 2006

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative, Thomas Krul, during a telephonic interview conducted on February 6, 2006. Based on the results of this interview, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to identify that the second adhesive layer is devoid of the electrically conductive particles. Claim 5 has also been amended to further clarify that the plurality of electrically conductive particles are located within the first adhesive layer rather than [unevenly distributed] within the first adhesive layer. Claims 7-10 have also been amended to identify the electrically conductive particles are positioned only within the first adhesive layer.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 5-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner noted "Amendments have been made to independent claims 1 and 6-10 to add the limitation that a boundary exists "between the first and second adhesive layer". However, it is not clear what is meant by such a limitation.""

The Examiner further noted with respect to Claim 5 that “it is not clear what is meant by “unevenly distributed within the first adhesive layer” in claim 5.”

Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 5 through 11 as noted above with respect to the interview conducted on February 6, 2006, and to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection of Claims 1 and 5 through 11.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamazaki (U.S. Pat. No. 4,696,764). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is initially noted Claims 9 and 10 have been amended to recite in part a thickness from an interface of the first and second adhesive layers to an outer surface of the second adhesive layer being thicker than a thickness from the interface to an outer surface of the first adhesive layer and adapted for application to the second terminals. Claims 9 and 10 have also been amended to recite in part a plurality of electrically conductive particles included within only the first adhesive layer “before the anisotropic conductive adhesive agent electrically connects the first terminals to the second terminals.”

Support for these amendments is found in paragraphs [0013], [0014], and [0015] of the specification.

As clearly shown in Figures 1 and 2 of Yamazaki only a single adhesive layer of resin is present, and as disclosed in column 10, lines 38-39, “the electrically conductive particles (b) are uniformly dispersed in the resin (a).”

Yamazaki does not disclose the Claim 9 limitation of “a second adhesive layer”. Yamazaki also does not disclose an interface between the first and second adhesive layers, and therefore that the second adhesive layer is “laminated onto the first adhesive layer, a thickness from an interface of the first and second adhesive layers to an outer surface of the second adhesive layer being thicker than a thickness from the interface to an outer surface of the first adhesive layer and adapted for application to the second terminals.” Yamazaki further does not disclose “a plurality of electrically conductive particles included within only the first adhesive layer.”

In addition to the discussion above with respect to Claim 9, Yamazaki does not disclose “a plurality of electrically conductive particles dispersed substantially in a plane and only within the first adhesive layer” as recited in amended Claim 10.

Yamazaki also does not disclose the “wherein the conductive particles remain substantially in the plane during assembly of the structure when the substrates are pressed together” limitation of Claim 11.

Yamazaki therefore does not anticipate Claims 9, 10 or 11. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of Claims 9, 10 and 11.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Feb. 7, 2006

By: 
S. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/mmk